



IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COLUMBIA DIVISION

LEONARD TONY EDDY a/k/a	§ CIVIL ACTION NO.	3:04-808-HFF-JRM
KING SOUTH C. SLAVE,	§	3:04-811-HFF-JRM
	§	3:04-812-HFF-JRM
	§	3:04-814-HFF-JRM
Plaintiff,	§	3:04-816-HFF-JRM
	§	3:04-817-HFF-JRM
vs.	§	3:04-818-HFF-JRM
	§	3:04-821-HFF-JRM
BONDED LOAN OFFICE <i>et al.</i> ,	§	3:04-906-HFF-JRM
	§	3:04-907-HFF-JRM
Defendants.	§	3:04-908-HFF-JRM
	§	3:04-909-HFF-JRM
	§	3:04-910-HFF-JRM
	§	3:04-911-HFF-JRM
	§	3:04-912-HFF-JRM

ORDER ADOPTING THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION OF THE
MAGISTRATE JUDGE AND DISMISSING CASES

These cases, filed separately but consolidated into one Report and Recommendation (Report), allege various claims for violation of civil rights and personal injury. Plaintiff is proceeding *pro se*. This matter is before the Court for review of the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation (Report) recommending that the cases be dismissed *without prejudice* and without issuance and service of process (with the exception of 3:04-811-HFF-JRM, for which dismissal *with prejudice* is recommended). The Report further recommends that the Court enter an injunction requiring pre-filing review of Plaintiff's future filings pursuant to *Graham v. Riddle*, 554 F.2d 133 (4th Cir. 1977).

The Report is made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 73.02(B)(2)(d) for the District of South Carolina.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. *Matthews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270 (1976). The Court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of those portions of the Report to which specific objection is made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge or may recommit the matter with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

The Magistrate Judge filed the Report on April 1, 2004, and Plaintiff failed to file any objections to the Report. In the absence of such objections, the Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. *Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983). Moreover, a failure to object waives appellate review. *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841, 845-46 (4th Cir.1985).

After a thorough review of the Report and the record in these cases pursuant to the standards set forth above, the Court adopts the Report and incorporates it herein. Therefore, it is the judgment of this Court that these cases be, and the same are hereby, **DISMISSED without prejudice**, with the exception of *Eddy v. Currie*, 3:04-811-HFF-JRM, which is **DISMISSED with prejudice**. It is further **ORDERED** that the Clerk of Court shall assign a docket number to any future action filed by Plaintiff but that each such action will be summarily dismissed by the Magistrate Judge to whom the case is referred. Plaintiff may appeal each summary dismissal, within ten days after entry of the order of dismissal, to the District Judge or Senior District Judge to whom the case is assigned.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Signed this 12th day of April, 2006, in Spartanburg, South Carolina.

s/ Henry F. Floyd
HENRY F. FLOYD
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

Plaintiff is hereby notified that he has the right to appeal this Order, in those cases where the United States, one of her agencies, or one of her officials is named as a defendant, within **sixty (60)** days from the date hereof, pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.

In all other cases, Plaintiff has the right to appeal this Order within **thirty (30)** days from the date hereof, pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.